

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 17 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 12, 14, 16-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Ohsugi *et al.*, ‘A Recommendation System for Software Function Discovery’ APSEC 2002, pages 248-257, hereafter “Ohsugi.” Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ohsugi in view of Arcuri *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,968), hereafter “Arcuri.”

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office objects to the use of the term “plurality of groups of users” in the claims as there is no description in the specification to support the aforementioned feature. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 12 and 17 to replace the term “plurality of groups of users” with “group of users”. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims fails to show an interrelationship between “defining a plurality of groups of users” with the rest of the elements in the claim. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 12 and 17 to make a more concise interrelationship between elements. For example, Applicant has revised the feature to read, “defining [] a group of users for which a user interface element will be modified”. For supporting disclosure, Applicant cites, for example, paragraph [0007] of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 14, 16, 17 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection over Oshugi, Applicant asserts that Oshugi does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 12 and 17, Applicant submits that Oshugi fails to teach a definition

system for defining from a plurality of users a group of users, wherein the group of users is less than the plurality of users. See claims 12 and 17, as amended.

Applicant admits the exact wording in the aforementioned feature is not explicitly disclosed in the instant application. However, Applicant contends that the feature is implicitly taught in the disclosure. Applicant cites, for example, the discussion of the definition system 32 found at paragraph [0030] for adequate support. “For example, group of users 52 could comprise all managers in a corporation, all employees in a department (e.g., technical support), selected individuals, a group of employees using application 40A-B for a given job function (e.g., purchasing), etc.” Paragraph [0030]. The discussion of various specific, narrow (i.e., less than entire) uses of applications by various groups of users in paragraph [0026] further buttresses support of this feature. Further, the use of the term “a group of users” throughout the disclosure is not surplusage. The group of users must necessarily be less than all users of a user interface. Otherwise, there would be no need to use the term, “group of users”; and, merely using “users” would suffice.

In any event, the Office alleges that the aforementioned feature is found at Ohsugi at figure 2 on page 250. Office Action, item 12, page 4. To this extent, nowhere does Ohsugi teach any type of defining system as in the claimed invention. In fact, as the “bold” arrows in figure 2, of Ohsugi, clearly show, all users’ usage histories are only sent. There is simply no suggestion of any type of defining in Ohsugi that narrows all users to a group of users. Thus, the collaborative filtering procedure of Ohsugi does not teach the defining of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore,

Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

D. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-11, 13, 15, 18 AND 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Ohsugi in view of Arcuri, Applicant asserts that the combined references cited by the Office fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1 and 10, as argued herein with respect to independent claims 12 and 17, Applicant respectfully submits that Oshugi fails to teach “...defining from a plurality of users a group of users for which a user interface element will be modified, wherein the group of users is less than the plurality of users.” Arcuri does not cure this deficiency, as it only pertains to a single user. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicant will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2008

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)